DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 050 687 HE 002 187

AUTHOR	Creager, John A.
TITLE	Evaluation and Selection of Academic Interns: 1967-1968.
INSTITUTION	American Council on Education, Washington, D.C. Office of Research.
REPORT NO	ACE-RR-Vol-6-NO-2-1971
PUB DATE	Feb 71
NOTE	31p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Administration, *Administrative Personnel, *Evaluation, *Higher Education, *Internship Programs, *Selection
IDENTIFIERS	*American Council on Education Internship Program

ABSTRACT

In 1964 the American Council on Education initiated an internship program for Fellows in Academic Administration. The purpose of the program was to enlarge the number, and to improve the quality of persons available to fill key positions in academic administration. This report presents and compares evaluation and selection infcrmation in the third year of the program with that from the first 2 years. Discussed are: (1) evaluation and selection procedures in the operational program; (2) background characteristics of the third-year groups; (3) evaluations at the home institutions; (4) the nominee evaluation process frcm nomination through interview; and (5) immediate postinternship followup studies. (AF)

OFFICE OF RESEARCH • AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

Evaluation and Selection of Academic Interns: 1967-1968

JOHN A. CREAGER

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

RESEARCH REPORTS
ACE

VOL. 6 NO. 2 • 1971

1

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

LOGAN WILSON, *PRESIDENT*

The American Council on Education, founded in 1919, is a council of educational organizations and institutions. Its purpose is to advance education and educational methods through comprehensive voluntary and cooperative action on the part of American educational associations, organizations, and institutions.

The Council's Office of Research was established in 1965 to assume responsibility for conducting research on questions of general concern to higher education. *ACE Research Reports* are designed to expedite communication of the Office's research findings to a limited number of educational researchers and other interested persons.

OFFICE OF RESEARCH

Alexander W. Astin
Director

Alan E. Bayer
Associate Director

RESEARCH ASSOCIATES
Robert F. Boruch
John A. Creager
David E. Drew
Jack E. Rossmann

VISITING SCHOLAR
Arthur W. Chickering

DATA PROCESSING STAFF
Gerald Richardson, *Chief*
Jeffrey Dutton
Penny Edgert
Helen Frazier
Cynthia Haines
Eugene Hankinson
Shawne Lampert
Charles Sell

STAFF ASSISTANT
Barbara Blandford

SECRETARIES
Margo King
Marion Nicholson
Jeannie Royer
Melvena Wimbs

RESEARCH ASSISTANTS
Ann Bisconti
Diane Dutton
Ellen Kuper

EDITORIAL STAFF
Laura Kent

ACE RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Nicholas Hobbs, *Chairman*
Provost, Vanderbilt University

Jessie Bernard
Research Scholar Honoris Causa
Pennsylvania State University

Allan M. Cartter
Chancellor
New York University

John G. Darley
Chairman, Department of Psychology
University of Minnesota

N. L. Gage
Professor of Education and Psychology
Stanford University

Richard C. Gilman
President
Occidental College

Ralph W. Tyler
Director Emeritus
Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences

Dael Wolfle
Graduate School of Public Affairs
University of Washington

Additional copies of this *Research Report* (Vol. 6, No. 2, 1971) may be obtained from the Office of Research, American Council on Education, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036.

ED050687

EVALUATION AND SELECTION OF ACADEMIC INTERNS: 1967-1968

John A. Creager

ACE RESEARCH REPORTS

Vol. 6, No. 2

February, 1971

Table of Contents

		Page
I.	Introduction	1
II.	Evaluation and Selection Procedures in the Operational Program	2
III.	Background Characteristics of the Third-year Groups	5
IV.	Evaluations at the Home Institution	8
V.	Nominee Evaluation: From Nomination Through Interview	12
VI.	Immediate Postinternship Followup Studies	19
VII.	References	25

List of Tables

Table		Page
1.	Disposition of Nominees at Various Stages of the Program	4
2.	Background Characteristics of 2nd and 3rd Year Groups	6
3.	Selected Correlations Among Mean Ratings for Home Evaluation Scales, Dossier, and Institution Scales - 3rd Year AAIP	10
4.	MAT Statistics - 3rd Year AAIP	13
5.	Nominee Evaluation Correlations - 3rd Year AAIP	16
6.	Correlations of Confidential Report Scales with CR Overall and Growth Ratings	23

Evaluation and Selection of Academic Interns: 1967-1968

In 1964 the American Council on Education initiated an internship program for Fellows in Academic Administration. The program was made possible by a grant from the Ford Foundation. The purpose of this program is to enlarge the number, and to improve the quality of persons available to fill key positions in academic administration. More specific operating objectives of the program are: (1) to identify qualified individuals, (2) to select the most promising among those identified, and (3) to provide the selectees with experiences designed to develop their potential for effective performance in administrative positions directly related to academic areas.

Following an initial planning and selection period the first group of fellows were on internship during the academic year 1965-66. At the same time, the Office of Research initiated a program of research on various aspects of the operational program in the implementation of its objectives. This research effort has focused on the first three years of the program and has produced three prior publications. Cox (1966) described the objectives and initial operating structure of the program. Astin (1966) presented the initial research results from the first year of the program; his report focused on the characteristics of participating institutions, the nominated candidates, the evaluation and selection process, and the selected fellows. Creager (1966) presented similar information for the second year of the program (1966-67), comparing results with those reported for the first-year group and with information from control groups of non-participating faculty members and academic deans.

The present report presents and compares evaluation and selection information in the third year of the program (1967-68) with that from the first two years. In addition it presents, for the first time, information about the evaluation of candidates by the home institutions. The emphasis in this report continues the descriptive and normative aspects of the evaluation and selection, carrying the third year group through the process to the initial post-internship evaluation of selected interns. In a forthcoming report (Creager, 1971), the documentation of the evaluation and selection procedures will be carried one step further in order to present results of career follow-up studies of those who completed their internship, and to summarize the significance of the research program completed on the first three years of the program. Although certain changes in the operating program were introduced with the fourth year of the program (1968-69), and will be summarized in the forthcoming report, the research based on the first three years of the program was useful in supporting the decision to make operational changes. Moreover, the present and forthcoming reports provide a research-based documentation of the experience obtained in the operational program. In spite of the relatively small numbers of persons in the program in any given year, the resulting information supplements the direct monitoring of the program accomplished by the operational personnel.

Evaluation and Selection Procedures in the Operational Program

With minor variations the evaluation and selection procedures used in the operational program were essentially the same in each of the first three years of the program. Presidents of the member institutions of the Council were asked to nominate a person considered to have outstanding promise for a career in academic administration. Each nominee submitted

a dossier consisting of a letter of recommendation from the nominating president, complete graduate and undergraduate transcripts, an application form, and an essay commenting on an article dealing with the selection of academic administrators. After initial screening for administrative reasons (completeness of information, meeting age requirements, etc.) the dossiers submitted by qualified nominees are evaluated by four-man teams, composed of outside consultants (usually university administrators) and professional staff of the Council. Each candidate thus received four dossier ratings, one from each judge, on a 5-point scale: Outstanding, Good, Acceptable, Doubtful, and Unacceptable. In the first and third years of the program, the essays were separately evaluated, but in the second year, the essays were included as part of the dossier. On the basis of the dossier ratings, varying numbers of candidates were selected for interviews.

Each candidate passing the dossier evaluation screen is interviewed by two three-man teams composed of college presidents and members of the Executive Staff of the Council. Each interviewer rated the candidate's overall potential as well as a set of traits, selected for their presumed relevance to success in academic administration and for their presumed amenability to being judged in a brief interview. Each candidate was discussed by the members of the two interviewing teams and fellowships offered to those judged most promising as academic administrators. The numbers of qualified nominees and their disposition at the main stages of selection are presented for all three years in Table 1. Differences between numbers of qualified nominees and interviewees include a few withdrawals as well as those eliminated by the dossier screen. Some candidates withdrew after successfully passing the interview screen.

Those selected as Fellows in Academic Administration typically

Table 1

Disposition of Nominees at Various Stages of the Program

Disposition Group	1965-66		1966-67		1967-68	
	f	%	f	%	f	
Total nominees	128	100.00	218	100.00	161	100
Administrative eliminations and early withdrawals	13	10.16	26	11.92	2	1
Qualified nominees (dossier rated)	115	89.84	192	88.08	159	98
Interviewees	113*	88.28	144	66.05	125	77
Those passing interview screen	24	18.75	50	22.93	53	32
Those completing internship	23	17.96	39	17.88	44	27

*Dossier ratings were not used as a pre-screening device the first year

spent the academic year at a "host" institution in the office of an experienced academic administrator, who usually served as the intern's mentor. Interns were expected to do certain assigned readings in the broad field of academic administration and to prepare an analytical report of some significance in this field. He was then expected to return to his home institution.

Background Characteristics of the Third-year Groups

Several items of information from the application form were studied for winners, non-winners and for the total nominee group. The non-winners were further studied in terms of the stage of elimination, dossier or interview. Comparisons of the resulting information across groups and against the corresponding information from the second-year groups provide useful information on some of the effects of evaluation and selection and how these changed. The results on background variables studied in both years are presented in Table 2. Data from the second-year group are quoted from a previous report (Creager, 1966); those from the third-year group are new.

A rather consistent pattern of differences may be observed between the second-year and third-year nominees. On those characteristics most relevant to the aims of the program, the third-year nominees are of a higher quality. This strongly suggests that the nominating presidents are doing a better job of evaluation on their campuses than was the case in the second year. This is probably the result of a clearer concept of the aims of the program and the type of persons to be identified, an improvement resulting from experience with the first two years of the program. To the extent that this is true, it is favorable with respect to the changes in the operating program introduced in the fourth year

Table 2

Background Characteristics of 2nd & 3rd Year Groups

Characteristic	Unit	Winners		Nonwinners		Qualified Nominees		Dossier Eliminees		Interns Eliminees		Significance[a] Comments	
		2nd	3rd	2nd	3rd	2nd	3rd	2nd	3rd	2nd	3rd	2nd	3rd
Current Position													
Administration	%	26	26	31	41	29	35	56	45	20	39	.01 elim	NSD
Dean	%	28	28	44	22	25	23	22	28	24	19	NSD	NSD
Department Chairman	%	14	28	13	30	13	30	5	24	16	32	NSD	NSD
Professor Faculty	%	80	94	79	91	80	92	56	76	88	97	.01 elim	.01 elim
Status													
Annual Salary	$1000	15.1	12.2	11.5	12.5	12.5	12.4	10.5	12.0	11.9	12.7	.05 both	NSD
Faculty Service	years	5.46	6.57	5.14	6.41	5.23	6.47	2.80	5.14	6.16	6.93	.01 elim	.01 elim
Rank	5-pt. scale	3.32	3.43	3.39	3.49	3.36	3.46	2.56	2.72	3.76	3.79	.01 elim	.01 elim
Administrative Experience													
Faculty Committee	%	44	77	53	73	50	75	30	69	63	75	.01 elim	NSD
Department Office	%	34	40	37	48	36	45	17	34	46	53	.01 elim	NSD
General Admin.	%	90	40	74	52	78	49	79	48	71	54	.05 N/NW	NSD
Student Life	%	48	26	28	10	34	15	43	10	21	10	.01 both	.01 W/NW
Publications													
Journal Articles	N	4.69	3.77	3.27	3.31	3.70	3.40	1.55	2.47	4.05	3.66	.01 both	NSD
Educational Background													
Doctorate or equiv.	%	88	98	72	89	76	92	45	73	84	96	.05 W/N	.01 elim
Graduate GPA	4-pt. scale	3.49	3.59	3.52	3.44	3.51	3.49	3.37	3.35	3.58	3.48	.01 elim	NSD
Undergraduate GPA	4-pt. scale	3.21	3.09	2.98	3.04	3.04	3.07	2.75	3.14	3.08	2.77	.01 elim	.01 elim

[a]Comparisons made for winners versus nonwinners (W/NW) and for interviewees versus dossier eliminees (elim.)
NSD = No significant difference.

where nearly all nominees become interns and the Council operations are focused on selection of Fellows.

Obviously, if one starts with a better nominee group, the Council's evaluation and selection of Fellows has become a more difficult task. The differences between winners and non-winners, and those by type of elimination, follow the same general pattern as previously observed but are systematically smaller in magnitude and of less statistical significance. This is exactly what one would expect if this nominee group was better than previous nominees on these background characteristics. Since information on these characteristics constitutes part of the dossier, we expect a greater <u>increase</u> in the quality of dossier eliminees than of interview eliminees and this is what is generally observed. At the interview stage, after the double screening at nomination and dossier evaluation stages, the appraisal is focused on a different set of variables. It is not an easy task in this third screening to make fine discriminations reliably. Some evidence will be presented in a later section that the interview judgments are, nevertheless, retaining much of their reliability in spite of the increased difficulty resulting from more selective pre-screening.

This general preliminary picture of the third-year operations seems consistent with program objectives. However, it is conceivable that the trend could continue so that the program became locked-in at the nomination stage, with the loss of some individuals who would, in fact, become good academic administrators. Here the size of the program is a crucial point. Moreover, one may question whether all academic administrators should necessarily have similar backgrounds. It is clear from the data in Table 2, as well as from previous reported data, that there

still remains considerable individual variation among nominees and within the group of winners. Continued policy review and monitoring of nominee characteristics should prove useful to maintaining program objectives within the present size of the program.

Evaluations at the Home Institution

As a part of the dossier obtained on each nominee, the nominating presidents are asked to choose three persons familiar with the candidate to complete and submit a structured evaluation form. Typically the president completes one such form and asks two others to do so, such as a vice president, dean, or department chairman. The evaluation forms become a part of the dossier that is evaluated by the professional staff of the Council. The nature and validity of the information provided by these forms have not been previously reported. With the changes in the operational program discussed earlier, the importance of evaluations at the home institution becomes more critical. This section reports some characteristics of this information.

The evaluation sheet consists primarily of a set of ratings on the 11 personality traits that are also evaluated in the interviews of those passing the dossier screen. In addition, ratings are obtained on Dependability, Personality, Acceptability to the Faculty as a Dean, Administrative Knowledge, and an Overall rating. Each form also seeks information on the rater-ratee relationship, including the number of years rater has known the subject. Out of 447 individual rating forms, 162 raters knew the nominee for 1-4 years, 144 knew the nominee 5-8 years, and 120 knew him nine or more years. Twenty-one raters did not supply this information. The distributions for the Overall rating were essentially the same for the three groups defined by length of time rater knew the nominee and for the groups defined by relationship between rater and ratee.

Distributions of Overall Home Institution Evaluation ratings are highly skewed, with most ratings at the top two levels of the five point scale. The result is higher mean ratings and lower variation than has usually been observed with the less skewed interview ratings. It should be noted that each nominee in the home evaluation has a unique set of raters and that the ratings are made in support of the nomination. This is in contrast to the interview ratings where the same group of judges observed all interviewees in a more nearly uniform situation. Moreover, the raters at the home institutions have observed the ratee over a period of time and in several situations, in contrast to the more highly specific and more structured interview situation. Nevertheless, the Home Evaluation ratings contain information useful for the dossier. An examination of the mean ratings and comparison of these with interview ratings clarifies the different meanings and utilities of the two rating systems. The mean home evaluation ratings for each nominee were therefore computed and used in the correlational analyses on which most of the ensuing discussion is based.

Selected correlations among mean ratings for Home Evaluation (HE) scales, the Dossier, and Interview rating scales are presented in Table 3. The first column of Table 3 shows correlations of each HE scale with the HE Overall ratings; the second column shows corresponding correlations between specific and Overall ratings at the interview stage for scales common to the HE scales. Also for the common scales, both specific and Overall, the correlations between mean HE ratings and mean interview ratings are presented in column 3. The last column shows the correlations between the mean HE ratings for all HE scales and the mean Dossier rating.

Table 3

Selected Correlations Among Mean Ratings for Home Evaluation

Scales, Dossier, and Institution Scales - 3rd Year AAIP

Scale	Home Evaluation Scale Vs. Home Evaluation Overall (N=158 Nominees)	Interview Scale Vs. Interview Overall (N=124 Interviewees)	Home Evaluation Scale Vs. Interview Overall (N=124 Interviewees)	Home Evaluation Scale Versus Dossier Rating (N=158 Nominees)
Poise	.50	.48	-.02	.22
Extent of Speech	-.14	.26	.38	-.15
Quality of Speech	.42	.58	.33	.21
Personal Appearance	.27	.54	.49	.08
Aggression	.03	.39	.30	-.06
Intelligence	.40	.69	.15	.24
Cultural Level	.34	.56	.21	.06
Candor	.30	.55	.07	.07
Enthusiasm	.25	.44	.44	.13
Conviction	.12	.29	.13	.01
Personal Relations	.57	.66	.18	.21
Dependability	.50	-	-	.25
Personality	.59	-	-	.26
Acceptability as a Dean	.65	-	-	.29
Administrative Knowledge	.32	-	-	.20
Overall	-	-	.09	.42

NOTE: r_{05} = .16 for 158 nominees; r_{05} = .18 for 124 interviewees.

One of the striking results is the low correlation (.09) between the Overall HE and the Overall Interview ratings. While at first sight this seems quite disappointing, further study of the related data clarifies the differences in what these two ratings measure and yields further insight into reasons for the low correlation. The HE Overall rating has high correlations with three of the four scales specific to home evaluation: Dependability, Personality, and Acceptability as Dean. These items are more readily evaluated by raters at the home institution where there is more extensive opportunity for the rater to observe the ratee than in the interview. These scales also have the highest correlations among the HE scales with the mean Dossier ratings (column 4), although they are lower than the correlations with HE Overall rating, in part because the Dossier rating contains other useful information (e.g., evidence of scholarly achievement and prior administrative experience). Put another way, the unique information in the home evaluations is used in making the Dossier evaluation (r is .42 between HE Overall and Dossier rating).

Turning attention to the HE scales in common with interview scales, the pattern of correlations with the Overall HE rating is similar to that for the Interview scales with the Overall interview rating. The HE scale correlations are generally lower, a fact resulting from the difference in the content of the two Overall ratings and to the greater skewness of the HE scale distributions. The correlations between corresponding scales (column 3) are not very high and are, in fact, markedly lower for those scales more highly related to the Dossier rating. These correlations are, in fact, attentuated by the pre-screening of nominees on the dossier rating, as is the correlation between the two Overall ratings.

The home evaluations have clearly been meaningful and useful in providing specific and relevant information to the dossier even before the operational changes instituted in the fourth year of the program. With these changes it becomes even more important to ensure increased reliability of the home evaluations. Raters should be encouraged to make fuller use of the range of the scales, and to make finer discriminations between scale items when rating an individual.

Nominee Evaluation: From Nomination Through Interview

Although the foregoing discussions were concerned with evaluation of nominees, as focused on background characteristics and home evaluations, both included in the dossier, this section presents further information regarding the evaluation and selection process. In general previously reported relationships involving dossier and interview evaluations are confirmed for the third year of the program, as will be discussed after a brief digression to discuss a special study.

Previous studies of the operational program indicated a high value placed by raters on "intelligence." Because intelligence ratings were being made by different raters and in a variety of situations, it was thought that a standard test of high level intellectual ability might prove useful to the program. Accordingly, the third year nominees were asked to submit scores on the Miller Analogies Test, a well known and difficult test of verbal reasoning ability. These scores were used only for research purposes and were not included in the operational evaluation and selection process. Although 84% of the nominees submitted test scores, only 62% took the form (L) operational at that time. The results of this experimental testing are presented in Table 4 for nominees, winners, dossier eliminees, interview eliminees, and total eliminees. Intergroup

Table 4

MAT Statistics - 3rd Year AAIP

Item	Winners (Interns & Alternates)	Eliminees, Dossier Stage	Eliminees, Interview Stage	Total Eliminees	Total Nominees
Total Number	53	34	72	106	159
Took MAT	48	21	65	86	134
Percent took MAT	90.57	60.00	90.10	81.13	84.27
Took Form L	44	20	60	80	125
Mean (Form L)	67.45	52.90	61.73	59.53	62.43
Standard Deviation (Form L)	17.41	21.05	15.51	17.35	17.68

NOTES: T-ratio for winners versus eliminees = 2.432

T-ratio for interview eliminees versus dossier eliminees = 2.009

9 nominees took a different form.

25 nominees did not take MAT; 7 withdrew.

differences are quite significant and all are in the direction expected if intelligence (in the sense of verbal reasoning ability) is in fact being noticed and used, however indirectly, in the evaluation and selection process. Moreover, the mean score of 62 for nominees compares very well with means reported for a wide variety of educational, scientific, industrial, and management groups.[1]

These findings indicate that verbal reasoning ability is a factor in the nominations, possibly by pre-selection to obtain a doctorate and to become a faculty member at the nominating institution, as well as in the evaluation of nominees at both dossier and interview stages. The test is, therefore, useful for characterizing groups and for monitoring the evaluation and selection process. Moreover, the size and pattern of group differences indicates that the test would be useful in early stages of evaluation and screening. There remains some question as to whether the costs of the testing and the administrative problems implied by the difficulty of obtaining recent and valid scores on all nominees are justified by the potential gains in selection efficiency. One estimate of potential gain indicates that the validity of the dossier rating against the final interview rating (estimated as .50 in the full third year nominee group) might increase to .56 by addition of the MAT score. This could be a useful gain, especially where the dossier is used in prescreening nominees for interviews. It may be more practical to encourage evaluators at the home institutions to consider such information when it is readily available at the nomination stage.

---

[1]Although these data are reported by the test publisher in the test manual, the individual studies were done by psychometricians at the using agencies. The author expresses his appreciation to Dr. Alexander Wesman, The Psychological Corporation, New York City, for cooperation in arranging for testing of the geographically dispersed nominee group.

The practice of using the mean dossier rating to screen out approximately one-fifth of the nominees prior to the extensive interview process was introduced in the second year of the program and was done again in the third year of the program. The rationale for using the dossier screen was based on the substantial correlation between the mean dossier rating and the mean Overall Interview rating, obtained on the unscreened nominees in the first year of the program (Astin, 1966). With the introduction of screening, correlations involving measurements after the screening can be computed directly only on the screened group, i.e., the interviewees. Such correlations are usually attentuated and are less directly relevant for validation of selection procedures. Corresponding correlations for the total nominee group may be estimated by statistical formulas (Guilford, 1950). Intercorrelations as obtained on the interviewees, and as estimated for the total nominee group are presented in Table 5. The obtained correlation of .35 between dossier ratings and Overall Interview rating compares well with the .39 previously reported for the second year group (Creager, 1966); the corresponding estimates for the total nominee groups are .50 and .57.

The steady drop in the correlation between Dossier and Overall Interview ratings from year to year may or may not be a blessing. It may well mean that interviewers are doing a job less redundant on the dossier evaluation than was the case in former years. If the correlation were much higher, the justification for the interview as permitting a "last look" at the candidate in a different setting would loose whatever appeal that it has. On the other hand, as the correlation continues to drop, the justification for prescreening the dossier evaluation becomes weaker. It is still at a level which is useful in a multi-stage evaluation and selection process, especially when the administrative effort and interviewer time is taken into account. With current levels of

Table 5

Nominee Evaluation Correlations - 3rd Year AAIP[a]

Variable	1	2	3	4	N
1. Dossier Rating (mean of 4)	---	.13	.22	.50	159
2. Essay Rating (mean of 2)	.13	---	.18	+.07	157
3. MAT Score	.19	.15	---	.33	134
4. Overall Rating (Interview; mean of 6)	.35	-.14[d]	.14[c]	---	125[b]

[a]Obtained correlations below diagonal; those estimated for Total Nominee group above diagonal.

[b]Eligible Nominees prescreened on Dossier Evaluation.

[c]113 interviewees took MAT.

[d]This is an example, frequently observed in data obtained from select pilots, where a low positive correlation computed in the total unselected population becomes negative when computed within the selected group.

validity and program size, continuation of the dossier screen is recommended with no change in the approximately one-fifth elimination rate.

The mean essay rating (variable 2 in Table 5) is the average rating given by two readers of essays submitted by the nominees. The essay assignment was changed from a commentary on an article by Robert M. Hutchins, required in the first two years of the program, to writing a memorandum to a college president on how to set up a student newspaper.[2] As in the case of the first year of the program, the essays were evaluated separately; in the second year, essays were considered as a part of the dossier. No statistical justification has yet been found for the essay requirement in the evaluation and selection of interns. Whatever value it has remains to be demonstrated in view of the administrative effort to obtain and evaluate the essays.

Regression analysis of the mean dossier rating confirms the previously reported results: Persons high on educational achievement as evidenced by attainment of the doctorate degree and undergraduate grades, and of scholarly attainment are more likely to obtain high ratings on the dossier. The corresponding multiple correlation is about .50, not quite as high as in the previous year (.55). It should be recalled that the Overall Home Evaluation rating correlates .42 with the dossier rating; inclusion of the Home Evaluation information increases the multiple correlation to about .60. The dossier

---

[2]The essay requirement:

The administration of a newly established public university is being urged by the student government to authorize the publication of a student newspaper. You are the president's assistant, and he has asked you to draw up a memorandum, giving due consideration to each of the following points.

a) Controls to be exercised by the administration.
b) Student editorial freedom and accountability.
c) Faculty or staff involvement.
d) Position regarding the outside public.

evaluation, then, consists in part of ascertaining that the nominee evidences scholarly achievement, and that the home institution says he has the personality and dependability in personal relationships, and the administrative knowledge that would make him acceptable as an academic dean.

Analyses of the interview ratings are generally confirmatory of previously reported results. For example, regression analysis of the Overall Interview ratings on the specific ratings shows that the correlation of the Intelligence rating is increased from .69 to .80 by addition of Ability in Personal Relations, Personal Appearance, Extent of Speech (with a negative weight) and with small positive contributions from Enthusiasm and Poise. Moreover, the rank order of validities (column 2 of Table 3) of the specific scales versus the Overall Interview rating is the same as in each of the first two years of the program, although somewhat lower. These lower correlations are to be expected as the discrimination asked of the interviewers becomes more difficult.

Summarizing the research results to this point, the following may be noted:

1. Improvement in the quality of nominees.

2. Continuation of and confirmation that the dossier evaluation emphasizes intelligence functioning in a scholarly way with the further information that home evaluation of potential ability for academic administration is noted and included in the dossier evaluation.

3. Validation of the use of the dossier evaluation as a screening device for reducing the pool of nominees to be interviewed.

4. Confirmation of the shift in emphasis from evaluation on intelligence as expressed in academic achievement in the dossier evaluation to emphasis on intelligence as expressed in direct personal confrontation, and skill in personal relations when "on the spot," in interview evaluation.

While the foregoing discussion has been concerned with characterizing

nominees, winners, and eliminees at various stages of the evaluation and selection process, and has noted the stability of results from one year to the next, more significant information bearing on the impact of the program and possible improvements of evaluation and selection procedures are best obtained by followup studies ascertaining what has happened to the various groups who did or did not hold an internship.

Immediate Postinternship Followup Studies

The first opportunity to obtain followup information occurs at the end of the internship period. At this point, usually in May of the internship year, the interns convene in a postinternship seminar. They are asked to complete a questionnaire at registration. In addition to eliciting information about the internship experience and current attitudes toward various academic matters, the intern is asked to supply names of four persons, including his mentor, acquainted with his work during the internship and from whom confidential evaluations of his performance as an intern might be obtained. The information resulting from the Intern Questionnaire and from his confidential reports provides some insight into how the program looks to both interns and hosts. The very small numbers of highly selected subjects seriously limits detailed statistical evaluation. Nevertheless the highlights of the resulting information may be briefly summarized.

The interns are practically unanimous in expressing the professional value of the experience. Nearly all agree that it broadened professional contacts, enabled them to learn new administrative techniques, and gave them experience in new problem areas and in dealing with various types of personnel. Moreover, many report that the experience deepened their understanding of the interrelations among administrative problems. A variety of other benefits are

mentioned spontaneously as specifications of "Other" benefits. These include insights into the home institution, learning about national problems with broadening and deepening insight into those involving higher education, seeing the academic picture as a whole, development of a personal philosophy of higher education and increased perspective, learning about administrative theory, and enabling the intern to know himself (or herself) more fully.

The interns typically indicate the following experiences, duties, and contacts as most beneficial to them during the internship:

a. The <u>variety</u> of contacts and participations, especially those involving visits to other institutions

b. Discussions <u>with</u> mentors, administrators, staff, and faculty.

c. Discussions <u>about</u> philosophy of education or of administration

d. Contact with state boards and offices

e. Attendance at regional and national meetings

f. Opportunities to observe operations, personnel relations, planning, accreditation, and budgeting,

g. Opportunity for reading, writing, and thinking.

When asked how to make the experience more beneficial, some did not answer or merely indicated satisfaction with the program as experienced. Others, however, suggested more contacts of the kind described as beneficial, more involvement and inclusion in meetings, affairs, and decisions, more direct contact with mentor or other person responsible for the intern, and more time to think. There is some disagreement among the interns as to whether the internship should be more structured, or less so, and in what ways.

Papers prepared during internship included those required by the American Council on Education, those prepared for host institution, and those

prepared for the intern's own use. The major benefit of paper preparation was cited by a dozen of the interns: aid in focussing, deepening, and expressing their thoughts. Three indicated that paper requirements stimulated them to seek out and develop some of the beneficial contacts mentioned above. Some, however, were frank to state that the papers were a chore, interferred with other more important activities, or were of peripheral value.

Similar qualitative information about the program itself was obtained from the confidential raters of the interns in addition to their ratings of the specific intern. General satisfaction with, and even praise, for the program is commonly expressed by the raters at the host institutions, which benefit in two major ways: through the specific staff studies and other duties performed by the intern, and through the astute and constructive criticism an intern can make. Such criticism from an outside perspective can be stimulating in forcing examination of the status quo and the values of the host institution. Suggestions for improvement of the internship program generally reinforce those given by the interns.

Excellent return rates on the Confidential Reports have been experienced with nearly all reports being rendered by mentors and other administrative personnel with whom the intern had working contact during the internship, although the amount of such contact was somewhat variable. The ratings of each intern were averaged across raters. Mean ratings computed across interns are in the superior-to-outstanding range, as expected since they are highly selected. The raters would very probably have recommended the ratee for an internship if the raters had been participating in the selection process. Moreover, most raters (80%) would want the interns they rated to fill an appropriate vacancy on their campus. Some of the ratings were difficult

to render, especially those on relations with other specific types of personnel, both academic and non-academic; presumably only a few raters have an opportunity to observe the intern in relation to all of the personnel categories involved. Some correlations between the remaining scales, the Overall Internship rating, and the "Growth during Internship" rating, are presented for third year interns in Table 6, with corresponding values on the first year interns shown for comparison. Although instability in the correlations computed on small groups make it inadvisable to interpret individual correlations, there is some consistency and sense in their pattern.

It was the hope that the mean ratings from the Confidential Reports could be used as interim criteria of the evaluation and selection process. However, in spite of the plausibility of the patterns of correlations internal to these ratings, validities for the dossier and interview ratings against the Intern ratings are generally low and positive, but not statistically significant. This is true even after attempts to correct the correlations for attenuation from selection on the dossier and interview variables.

One explanation for this result is suggested by the different nature of scales on which ratings are made in preinternship evaluation from those in the postinternship evaluation. The former emphasize various traits and general behaviors of the individual while the latter emphasize actual performance and growth during the internship. The specific traits of initiative and persistence rated in the Confidential Reports are not specifically rated in the home evaluations or in the interview situation. The "Overall" scales have a different meaning and context. Further study of the Confidential Report ratings, especially their means and standard deviations, suggests that they are reliable in the sense of inter-rater agreement on a given intern, but

Table 6

Correlations of Confidential Report Scales with CR

Overall and Growth Ratings*

Rating Scale	Correlation With Overall Rating		Correlation With "Growth" Rating	
	1st yr.	3rd yr.	1st yr.	3rd yr.
Overall	---	---	.74	.90
Growth during internship	.74	.90	---	---
Administrative judgment	.90	.94	.61	.84
Achievement on assignments	.77	.63	.44	.45
Initiative	.79	.41	.80	.37
Persistence	.69	.11	.68	.18
Would have recommended for:				
internship	.90	.81	.80	.78
vacancy on campus	.80	.75	.76	.74
Would expect to perform as:				
Department chairman	.27	.42	.13	.34
President/small college	.81	.55	.70	.45
President/junior college	.62	.62	.40	.43
President/large college	.51	.43	.40	.44
Academic vice president	.62	.71	.47	.64
Academic dean	.56	.54	.41	.46
Dean of students	.04	.39	-.10	.35
Fiscal or business officer	.19	.15	-.03	.13
Chief development officer	.19	.40	.13	.31
Distinguished professor	.13	.06	.18	.06

*Interns only.

not very reliable in the sense of mean ratings distinguishing among interns at different institutions. In any case the most crucial question is the longer range validity of these three summary evaluations (Dossier, Interview, and Immediate Postinternship) for predicting career status as academic administrators. In view of the demonstrated content validity and interrelationship between the Dossier and Interview Ratings, one would expect moderate validities against such career status, and that they would tend to be similar for the two evaluations. The lack of substantial relationship within the intern group between each of these two evaluations and the Postinternship rating means that the latter is on its own, i.e., the explanation suggested above would be confirmed if we found little external validity for the postinternship ratings, while finding such external validity would mean that something is happening in the internship situation that is helpful to the career status outcome, even though such information would not bear on the selection procedures.

The career status followup study of both former interns and of former candidates who did not complete an ACE internship from the first three years of the program is the subject of a forthcoming report (Creager, 1971). That report is focussed on the validity of the program as a whole, with selection and program effects confounded, and on the validity of various individual measurements whether preinternship, postinternship, operational, or experimental. In this context the comparative validity of selection and postinternship operational measures within the group of interns will be examined and discussed in terms of impact of the internship experience. The report of the results of such a followup study represents the major aim and a culmination of the research program in support of the operational program.

References

Astin, A. W. "Research Findings on the Academic Administration Internship Program," Educational Record, Spring 1966, 173-184.

Cox, L. "The ACE Academic Administration Internship Program," Educational Record, Spring 1966, 163-172.

Creager, J. A. "Evaluation and Selection in the 1966-67 Academic Administration Internship Program," ACE Research Reports, Vol. 1, No. 3. Washington: American Council on Education, 1966.

Creager, J. A. "Goals and Achievements of An Internship Program in Academic Administration," ACE Research Reports, Vol. 6, No. 3. Washington: American Council on Education, 1971.

Guilford, J. P. Fundamental Statsitics in Psychology and Education (2nd ed.). New York, Toronto, London: McGraw-Hill Company, Inc., 1950, 349-50.

Hutchins, R. M. "Our Misconception of University Leads to Mis-Selecting Heads." Los Angeles Times Syndicate, 1964.

Other Recent Publications by the Staff of the Office of Research American Council on Education

Astin, A.W., *Campus Disruption, 1968-69: An Analysis of Causal Factors,* **Psychology and the Problems of Society.** Washington: American Psychological Association, 1970. Pp. 377–387.

Astin, A. W., and Panos, R. J., **The Educational and Vocational Development of College Students.** Washington: The American Council on Education, 1969, 211 pp.

Astin, A. W., *Measuring Student Outputs in Higher Education,* **The Outputs of Higher Education: Their Identification, Measurement, and Evaluation.** Boulder, Colorado: WICHE, 1970. Pp. 75–83.

Astin, A. W., *The Methodology of Research on College Impact (I),* **Sociology of Education,** Vol. 43, No. 3, Summer, 1970. Pp. 223–254.

Astin, A. W., and Boruch, R. F., *A "Link" System for Assuring Confidentiality of Research Data in Longitudinal Studies,* **American Educational Research Journal,** Vol. 7, No. 4, November, 1970. Pp. 615–624.

Bayer, A. E., *College and University Faculty: A Statistical Description,* **ACE Research Reports,** Vol. 5, No. 5, 1970, 48 pp.

Bayer, A. E., *Institutional Correlates of Faculty Support of Campus Unrest,* **ACE Research Reports,** Vol. 6, No. 1, 1971, 26 pp.

Bayer, A. E., and Boruch, R. F., *Black and White Freshmen Entering Four-Year Colleges,* **Educational Record,** Vol. 50, No. 4, Fall, 1969. Pp. 371–386.

Bayer, A. E., and Astin, A. W., *Violence and Disruption on the U.S. Campus: 1968-1969,* **Educational Record,** Vol. 50, No. 1, Winter, 1969. Pp. 337–350.

Bayer, A. E., Astin, A. W., and Boruch, R. F., *Social Issues and Protest Activity: Recent Student Trends,* **ACE Research Reports,** Vol. 5, No. 2, 1970, 33 pp.

Boruch, R. F., *A Procedure for Estimation of Trait, Method, and Error Variance Attributable To A Measure,* **Educational and Psychological Measurement,** Vol. 30, No. 3, Autumn, 1970. Pp. 547–574.

Boruch, R. F., Larkin, J. D., Wolins, L., and McKinney, A. C., *Alternative Methods of Analysis: Multitrait-Multimethod Data,* **Educational and Psychological Measurement,** Vol. 30, No. 4, Winter, 1970. Pp. 833–853.

Creager, J. A., *Fortran Programs Providing Weights in Survey Designs Using Stratified Samples,* **Educational and Psychological Measurement,** Vol. 29, No. 3, Autumn, 1969. Pp. 709–712.

Creager, J. A., and Sell, C. L., *The Institutional Domain of Higher Education: A Characteristics File for Research,* **ACE Research Reports,** Vol. 4, No. 6, 1969, 83 pp.

Drew, D. E., *A Profile of the Jewish Freshman,* **ACE Research Reports,** Vol. 5, No. 4, 1970, 53 pp.

Drew, D. E., *On the Allocation of Federal Funds for Science Education,* **ACE Research Reports,** Vol. 5, No. 7, 1970, 44 pp.

Drew, E. D., *Undergraduates Planning a Career in Medicine,* **Report of the Ninth Annual Conference on Research in Medical Education.** Washington: Association of American Medical Colleges, 1970. Pp. 215–220.

Folger, J. K., Astin, H. S., and Bayer, A. E., **Human Resources and Higher Education,** New York: Russell Sage, 1970, 475 pp.

Holtmann, A. G., and Bayer, A. E., *Determinants of Professional Income Among Recent Recipients of Natural Science Doctorates,* **Journal of Business,** Vol. 43, No. 3, October, 1970. Pp. 410–418.

Schoenfeldt, L. F., Bayer, A. E., and Brown, M. D., *Delayed and Normal Progress College Students: A Comparison of Psycho-Social Characteristics and Career Plans,* **American Educational Research Journal,** Vol. 7, No. 2, March, 1970. Pp. 235–250.

Staff of the Office of Research, *National Norms for Entering College Freshmen–Fall 1970,* **ACE Research Reports,** Vol. 5, No. 6, 1970, 100 pp.